



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/767,449	01/23/2001	David S. Matthews	XER 2 0381 D/A0617	2428

7590 06/01/2005
Albert P. Sharpe, III, Esq.
Fay, Sharpe, Fagan
Minnich & McKee, LLP
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2518

EXAMINER

THOMPSON, JAMES A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/767,449

Applicant(s)

MATTHEWS ET AL.

Examiner

James A. Thompson

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 13-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8-12 and 19-20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 13 December 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding page 7, lines 20-34: While it is true that Alimpich (US Patent 6,128,017) teaches a single error button, the combination of Alimpich and Franklin (US Patent 5,852,436) fully teaches the newly amended claims. The rejections of claims 1 and 13 based on the prior art are given below. The new grounds of rejection are necessitated by Applicant's amendments.

Regarding page 8, lines 1-30: Franklin teaches additional features which one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention could clearly have added to the teachings of Alimpich. While Applicant is correct in asserting that the central notes facility of Franklin is overall more flexible in that the notes do not have to permanently attach themselves to a single object, the *combination* of Alimpich and Franklin would suggest linking the notes to the error window taught by Alimpich. Clearly the portion of the teachings of Franklin that allow for notes to be attached to one object and later to another object would not be used when combining the teachings of Franklin with Alimpich.

Further, Applicant is respectfully reminded that the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2624

the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Regarding page 8, line 32 to page 9, line 11: As Applicant admits in the present arguments, and as has been clearly demonstrated on page 9 of the previous office action, dated 02 August 2004, Knodt (US Patent 5,987,535) teaches an icon that represents the printing status. While Knodt does not specifically demonstrate a fault or error icon, a print fault or print error is clearly a particular type of print status. Alimpich in view of Franklin has been relied upon to teach the displaying of the fault or error. Knodt has been relied upon to teach using an icon to display a print status. The combination of Alimpich in view of Franklin with Knodt teaches that the icon taught by Knodt displays a print status, wherein the print status is the displayed fault or error that is taught by Alimpich. Further, the mere use of an icon to display a particular state of any computer system, whether it is a printer fault, a computer memory fault, a computer login status, or any other type of status, is trivial in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art would easily have been motivated by the teachings of Knodt to use an icon, as taught by Knodt, to display the printer fault taught by Alimpich. The use of an icon is simply another means by which one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to choose to display information deemed relevant to the task at hand.

Regarding page 9, lines 12-21: Again, the amendments to the claims have been rejected over the prior art, as discussed below in detail. The new grounds of rejection are necessitated by Applicant's amendments.

Art Unit: 2624

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-6 and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alimpich (US Patent 6,128,017) in view of Franklin (US Patent 5,852,436).

Regarding claims 1 and 13: Alimpich discloses a graphical user interface system (figure 4 of Alimpich) comprising a fault screen window (figure 4(53) and column 4, lines 20-21 of Alimpich) on a display screen (figure 4(50) and column 4, lines 2-5 of Alimpich) and including a device fault button (figure 4(51) and column 4, lines 16-21 of Alimpich) corresponding to an individual supply unit (column 2, lines 55-65 of Alimpich) and output unit devices associated with the printing system (column 3, lines 39-44 and column 4, lines 25-32 of Alimpich).

Alimpich does not disclose expressly multiple device fault buttons, each device fault button corresponding to individual supply unit and output devices associated with said printing system; and a fault notes window spaced from said fault screen window on said display screen and including a text box for accepting and displaying user editable text, said fault notes window being linked to said fault screen window.

Franklin discloses a notes window (figure 7(67) of Franklin) and a corresponding screen window (figure 7(71) and

Art Unit: 2624

column 7, lines 10-13 and lines 17-21 of Franklin), said notes window spaced from said screen window on said display screen (figure 15 and column 9, lines 37-42 of Franklin) and including a text box (figure 13(116) of Franklin) for accepting and displaying user editable text (column 8, lines 45-49 and lines 65-66 of Franklin), said notes window being linked to said screen window (column 7, lines 9-13 and lines 26-30 of Franklin). Further, there are multiple notes windows, each notes window with a corresponding activating button (figure 8 (76) and column 7, lines 30-35 of Franklin). Each note can be attached (column 7, lines 30-35 of Franklin) to a separate application window (column 7, lines 2-10 of Franklin).

Alimpich and Franklin are combinable because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the display of relevant textual data messages in a computer window interface. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the multiple notes windows taught by Franklin to create and display user-editable fault notes in the interface taught by Alimpich. There are multiple fault notes windows, each associated with a corresponding screen window (column 7, lines 2-10 of Franklin) which is created by a computer application (column 7, lines 30-37 of Franklin). Thus, each fault notes window would be modified by one of ordinary skill in the art according to the teachings of Alimpich, thus associating each fault notes window with the individual supply unit or an output unit associated with said printing system. Instead of associating a notes window with an application, one of ordinary skill in the art would associate the fault notes window with a relevant input or output device, especially the input and output devices also use computer applications to

Art Unit: 2624

interface with the overall printing system. The motivation for doing so would have been to use an electronic equivalent of conventional paper notes with adhesive backing (column 3, lines 11-13 of Franklin) that can be attached to each application (column 3, lines 13-17 of Franklin), or device as taught by Alimpich, thus giving needed information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Franklin with Alimpich to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1 and 13.

Further regarding claim 13: The system of claim 1 performs the method of claim 13.

Regarding claims 2-3 and 14-15: Alimpich discloses that said fault screen window (figure 4(50) of Alimpich) includes a fault notes icon (figure 4(52) and column 4, lines 19-21 of Alimpich). Further, said fault notes icon can also be considered a button (figure 4(52) of Alimpich).

Alimpich does not disclose expressly that said fault notes window is accessed by selecting said fault notes icon.

Franklin discloses that a notes window is accessed by selecting a notes icon in a window (figure 10(92) and column 7, lines 62-67 of Franklin).

Alimpich and Franklin are combinable because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the display of relevant textual data messages in a computer window interface. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to select said fault notes window by selecting a notes button, as taught by Franklin, said notes window being placed inside a larger window, as taught by Alimpich. The motivation for doing so would have been to have a means to access the user-editable error messages and see the error state (column 4, lines 39-43 of Alimpich). Therefore, it

Art Unit: 2624

would have been obvious to combine Franklin with Alimpich to obtain the invention as specified in claims 2-3 and 14-15.

Regarding claims 4 and 16: Alimpich discloses that a specific button (figure 4(52b) of Alimpich) for said fault screen window is configured to appear when fault text has previously appeared in said fault screen window (column 4, lines 39-41 of Alimpich).

Alimpich does not disclose expressly that said fault notes icon is configured to appear when user editable text has previously been entered in said text box.

Franklin discloses that said notes window (figure 7(67) of Franklin) is attached to a window (figure 7(71) of Franklin) and said notes icon (figure 8(76) of Franklin) can be used to access said text box (figure 13(116) and column 7, lines 29-37 of Franklin) which already has user-editable text (column 3, lines 23-27 and column 7, lines 2-4 of Franklin). Therefore, for a notes icon to appear, user-editable text must already have been previously entered into said notes window.

Alimpich and Franklin are combinable because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the display of relevant textual data messages in a computer window interface. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have said notes icon appear when user-editable text has been entered into said text box, as taught by Franklin, said notes icon and said text box being used to list device faults, as taught by Alimpich. The motivation for doing so would have been to give a smaller, collapsed representation of said fault notes window while still providing a clear indication as to what item said fault notes window is anchored (column 7, lines 32-35 of Franklin). Therefore, it

Art Unit: 2624

would have been obvious to combine Franklin with Alimpich to obtain the invention as specified in claims 4 and 16.

Regarding claims 5 and 17: Alimpich does not disclose expressly that a first device fault button of said multiple device fault buttons is selected and said text box is related to said first device fault button.

Franklin discloses that said notes window displays user-editable text related to the application (column 3, lines 23-27 of Franklin) when the associated button is selected (column 7, lines 49-51 of Franklin).

Alimpich and Franklin are combinable because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the display of relevant textual data messages in a computer window interface. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the notes window taught by Franklin in the graphical user interface system of Alimpich to display the editable text relating to the associated application, as taught by Franklin, said associated application being the application used to interface with an associated one of the devices taught by Alimpich. The motivation for doing so would have been to use an electronic equivalent of conventional paper notes with adhesive backing (column 3, lines 11-13 of Franklin) that can then be attached to the application (column 3, lines 13-17 of Franklin), thus giving needed information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Franklin with Alimpich to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5 and 17.

Regarding claims 6 and 18: Alimpich discloses that none of said multiple device fault buttons are selected and said text box is related to said printing system (column 4, lines 15-21 of

Art Unit: 2624

Alimpich). The text box contains information related to the printing system, but the user is not required to select a device fault button. The device fault button may simply remain highlighted informing the user of an error (column 4, lines 15-18 of Alimpich).

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alimpich (US Patent 6,128,017) in view of Franklin (US Patent 5,852,436), Knodt (US Patent 5,987,535), and obvious engineering design choice.

Regarding claim 7: Alimpich discloses a graphical user interface system (figure 4 of Alimpich) comprising a view selection window on a display screen (figure 4(area under "Printers and Jobs" which includes 50 and 52) and column 2, lines 31-34 of Alimpich) and including a fault button (figure 4(52) (button also shown as figure 2(51)) of Alimpich) (column 4, lines 14-16 and lines 19-21 of Alimpich); and a system window spaced from said view selection window on said display screen (figure 4(window labeled "Printers" with a tabulated listing of the printers of the system) of Alimpich), wherein said system window provides an overall system view of said printing system, said system window including a plurality of boxes representing devices comprising said printing system. As can be clearly seen in figure 4, there are a plurality of boxes in a system window representing "Printer 1", "Printer 2", "Printer 3", and "Printer 4" under the icon and heading "Printers".

Said system further comprises a fault screen window spaced from said view selection window (figure 4(53) and column 4, lines 2-5 of Alimpich) and said system window displaying recent faults that have occurred in said printing system (column 4,

Art Unit: 2624

lines 14-16 and lines 19-21 of Alimpich), wherein said fault screen window is opened by selecting at least one of said fault button and a fault icon (column 4, lines 41-43 of Alimpich).

Alimpich does not disclose expressly a plurality of system component icons, each system component icon representing an individual component of said printing system, including supply unit and output unit devices; a fault icon corresponding to each individual component of said printing system having a fault condition, wherein each fault icon is displayed in the proximity of a corresponding system component icon; and a fault notes window spaced from said view selection window, said system window, and said fault screen window on said display screen and including a text box for accepting and displaying user editable text, said fault notes window being linked to said fault screen window.

Franklin discloses a notes window (figure 7(67) of Franklin) linked to a screen window (figure 7(71) and column 7, lines 10-13 and lines 17-21 of Franklin) for accepting and displaying user editable text (column 8, lines 45-49 and lines 65-66 of Franklin), said notes window being linked to said screen window (column 7, lines 9-13 and lines 26-30 of Franklin).

Alimpich and Franklin are combinable because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the display of relevant textual data messages in a computer window interface. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the notes window taught by Franklin in the graphical user interface system of Alimpich to create user-editable fault notes in said fault screen window. The motivation for doing so would have been to use an electronic

Art Unit: 2624

equivalent of conventional paper notes with adhesive backing (column 3, lines 11-13 of Franklin) that can then be attached to the application (column 3, lines 13-17 of Franklin), thus giving needed information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Franklin with Alimpich.

Alimpich in view of Franklin does not disclose expressly a plurality of system component icons, each system component icon representing an individual component of said printing system, including supply unit and output unit devices; a fault icon corresponding to each individual component of said printing system having a fault condition, wherein each fault icon is displayed in the proximity of a corresponding system component icon; and that said fault notes window is spaced from said view selection window, said system window, and said fault screen window on said display screen.

Knodt discloses representing the devices of a printer system with a plurality of system component icons (column 4, lines 18-25 of Knodt), as can clearly be seen in figure 5 of Knodt. Figure 5 of Knodt contains an icon for the scanner (shaped like a computer and near the words "Scan to File"), the fax machine (shaped like a phone receiver and one near the words "Fax Out" and one to the left of the words "Fax In"), the copier (shaped like overlapping document pages and near the words "Copy Jobs"), and the printer (shaped like a computer and to the left of the words "Print Jobs").

Knodt further discloses an icon for each device (figure 5 (62) of Knodt) having a status condition that is displayed in the proximity of an icon representing said device (column 4, lines 34-39 of Knodt). The icon (figure 5(62) of Knodt) shows a print job status (column 4, lines 34-39 of Knodt) and, as can be

Art Unit: 2624

seen in figure 5 of Knodt, is clearly in the proximity of an icon representing the corresponding device.

Alimpich in view of Franklin is combinable with Knodt because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the display of relevant data messages in a computer window interface. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use icons to represent the devices of the printer system and the status of said devices, as taught by Knodt, said status being the fault status taught by Alimpich. The motivation for doing so would have been to immediately present to an operator the status of the system (column 2, lines 14-18 of Knodt) since a system with multiple components can aggravate the level of confusion in properly setting up print jobs (column 1, lines 26-30 of Knodt). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Knodt with Alimpich in view of Franklin.

Alimpich in view of Franklin and Knodt does not disclose expressly that said fault notes window is spaced from said view selection window, said system window, and said fault screen window on said display screen. However, the precise placement of a particular window on a display screen is merely a matter of obvious engineering design choice. The designer simply needs to select a window positioning scheme that the design believes will look good and be functional. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to space said fault notes window from said view selection window, said system window, and said fault screen window on said display screen based on factors such as: (1) the size of the display screen, (2) the resolution of the pixels, (3) the type of likely user, and (4) personal aesthetic consideration. Therefore, a

Art Unit: 2624

simple engineering design choice is combined with the system taught by Alimpich in view of Franklin and Knodt to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 8-12 and 19-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claim 19 depends from claim 7 and adds the limitations that there are multiple fault buttons, each of which correspond to both a fault icon and a individual printing system component and is further linked to the fault notes window. Examiner deems that the linking of the fault notes buttons, fault notes icons, and fault notes windows performed in addition to the limitations present in claim 7 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Further, Examiner has been unable to find a reference in the prior art that teaches each and every limitation of claim 19, which includes the limitations of claim 7, from which claim 19 depends. Therefore, claim 19 is considered to contain allowable subject matter. Further, 8-12 depend from claim 19 and therefore also contain allowable subject matter.

Claim 20 recites a system window that includes a plurality of a specific type of system component icons and a plurality of a specific type of fault icons. Examiner has been unable to find a reference that teaches each and every limitation of claim

Art Unit: 2624

20, which includes the limitations of claim 13, from which claim 20 depends. Therefore, claim 20 is considered to contain allowable subject matter.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James A. Thompson whose telephone number is 571-272-7441. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the

Art Unit: 2624

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James A. Thompson
Examiner
Art Unit 2624

JAT
29 April 2005



THOMAS D.
~~LEE~~ LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER